



Issue Forum Funding

Sustainable Recreation Work Group

Presented:

March 30, 2009



Forum Objectives

Work to develop preliminary recommendations to present for full workgroup deliberation beginning May 7th.



Agenda

- 10:00 a.m. **Forum discussion begins**
- 5 minutes **Welcome**
- 15 minutes **Update on FY 09-11 budget**
- 20 minutes **Background Presentation**
- 20 minutes **“Roundtable”**
- 20 minutes **Facilitated discussion**
- 10 minutes **Summarize status of possible preliminary recommendations**
- 10 minutes **Discussion of presentation to full workgroup May 7th**
- 5 minutes **Feedback & Wrap up**



09-11 Budget Updated



Background On Funding



Voting Exercise on Funding

- **Voting was done by forum members, and then by other work group members**
- **Options from stakeholder group survey and forum members placed into 5 funding categories**
 - **Dedicated Revenue Source**
 - **Fee**
 - **Tax**
 - **Miscellaneous**
 - **Sponsorship**



Voting Exercise Feedback

- **Options receiving 6 or more votes:**
 - New Statutory Trust 9
 - Expedited Tax Perf. Review 9
 - Increase NOVA 7
 - Specialty Vanity Plates 7
 - Overnight Camping Fees 7
 - Percent of Lottery Funds 6



Voting Exercise Feedback

- **Options receiving 4-5 votes:**
 - Fees for Commercial Guides 5
 - Tab Fees for Non-Motorized Uses 5
 - State Bond for Specific Areas 5
 - Tax on Outdoor Equipment/Services 5
 - Collect Fees at Popular Sites 4
 - Sponsorship of Site and Trails 4
 - Use Infraction \$ for Educ. & Enforc. 4
 - Assign Caretaking to Groups 4



Sustainable Funding

- **Funding source must be able to pay long term to adequately:**
 - **Develop** (planning and construction)
 - **Manage** (Maintenance, signage, and E&E)
- **Per landscape:**
 - **\$6.5 million in initial costs**
 - **\$205,000 annual in upkeep**
- **74 Landscapes throughout the state**



Lottery Revenue (\$4-8 million)

- **Tickets sold to the general public, with profits going to various beneficiaries** (e.g. Education Construction Fund)
- Eight different types of lottery games
- In 2008, \$130 Million raised for beneficiaries
 - Specific Scratch games: \$4.7 million Safeco Field and \$8.5 million Qwest Field
- **Pros**
 - Stable funding source
 - System in place for allocating funding
 - Already used for recreation (Safeco & Qwest Fields)
- **Cons**
 - 60% Approval from both houses
 - Amend existing statutes
 - Potential image of promoting gambling



Specialty License Plates (\$40-100,000)

- **Vehicle owners can purchase specialty plates to benefit specific causes from non-profits to government programs.**
- Money to beneficiaries in 2008:

Wild for Washington	\$107,000
State Parks	\$49,000
- **Pros**
 - Utilizes an existing system to produce and collect
 - Citizens voluntarily choose to give
 - Good advertising for DNR
- **Cons**
 - Amend existing statutes
 - Small sum of money generated



New Statutory Trust (\$30 Million)

- **Create new statutory trust, that would be managed to provide funding for the benefit of DNR recreation.**
 - Managed analogous to existing trust lands
 - Initial start up costs: \$350 million over 10 years
 - Create positive rate of return after 4 years
- **Pros**
 - Ideal time to purchase land
 - Stable long-term revenue source
 - Could provide more recreational opportunities depending on type of land
- **Cons**
 - Large initial investment
 - Pass new statutes
 - Concerns of having more government land and using lands to generate public \$



Camping Fees (\$-20,000 - \$800,000)

- **Charge a fee for camping in state forests, with proceeds going to fund the recreation program.**
- Three important factors for a successful fee program
 - Practical means of collection
 - Large enough number of campsites in campgrounds
 - Consistent charging of fees throughout state
- **Pros**
 - Great tool to control an area
- **Cons**
 - Amend statutes, including recreational immunity
 - Concerns of having more government land and using lands to generate public \$



NOVA Funding (Increase of \$2.3 million to NOVA and \$1.1 million to DNR)

- **Increase the amount going to NOVA “refund”**
 - Adjusting the rate the “refund” to match the actual gas tax
 - Current rate for calculating “refund” is 21 cents per gallon
 - Actual rate of the gas tax is 37.5 cents per gallon
- **Pros**
 - Large stream of revenue
 - Based on existing system
 - DNR would receive an increase in their direct appropriation
- **Cons**
 - Amend statutes
 - Reduction in revenue for the Dept. of Transportation



Questions?



Roundtable

Preferences and rationales



Summarize

Status of possible preliminary
recommendations



Presentation

To may 7th Workgroup meeting



Feedback

How did this meeting format
work for you?



Wrap-up



Thank you!